

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application.

Applicants respectfully respond to this Office Action and traverse all rejections. Applicants add new claim 21.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siwko (NPL WX-001017264) in view of Redden (EP 0658014).

Claims 5, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siwko in view of Redden (EP 0658014) as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 8, 10, 14, 16 and 19, and further in view of Weishaupt (U.S. Patent 4,493,102).

Applicants restate previous arguments and highlight the distinctions between the initial call request block probability in Applicants' claims and the dropping probability in the cited art.

All of Applicants' claims are novel and nonobvious over the cited art. Specifically, the independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 19 include the features of: **receiving at the mobile station** an initial **call request block probability**, wherein the block probability is determined by a **network element, determining an elapsed time** from an effective time of said initial call request block probability, and **adjusting said initial call request block probability** based on said elapsed time.

Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness for Applicants' independent claims because not all of the features of Applicants' independent claims are taught by the combination of Siwko and Redden or by the combination of Siwko, Redden, and Weishaupt. Further, Examiner has not offered a motivation for combining the teaching of admission based on a calling dropping probability (Sisko) with a satellite system which uses a threshold of available traffic channels to inhibit subscriber classes (Redden).

Siwko and Redden do not teach all elements of Applicants' claim 1 or any other of Applicants' claims. Sisko and Redden do not teach **"receiving at the mobile station** an initial **call request block probability**, wherein the block probability is determined by a **network element"** as in Applicants' claims. Rather Sisko teaches "a call admission control" based on a

dropping probability. (Please see Sisko, section II). Redden neither teaches nor recites receiving at a mobile station an initial call request block probability. Instead the procedure in Redden “determines if the number of available traffic channels is below a predetermined threshold” and including or inhibiting subscriber classes based upon this determination. Please see Redden page 14, lines 4-22. While a communication node receives a parameter set including a list of inhibited classes, there is no teaching of receiving or modifying a call request block probability in Redden. Therefore, Siwko and Redden do not teach the “**receiving an initial call request block probability**, wherein the block probability is determined by a **network element**” as in Applicants’ claims.

Sisko recites a **dropping probability** which is distinct from the **call request block probability** in Applicants’ claims. Sisko states that “we assume the existence of a dropping probability threshold which forms part of the QOS guaranteed by the network to every admitted call. In other words, the network **guarantees** dropping probabilities on an individual call basis, just as it guarantees other common QOS parameters such as packet loss, delay, and jitter.” (Sisko page 1151, second column). Hence, in Sisko the dropping probability is a QOS guarantee by the network of **dropping** a call after it is established.

Applicants claims include an **initial call request block probability**. This is the probability of a call origination being blocked. For example, please see paragraph [1038] in Applicants’ specification. Thus, the **initial call request block probability** is distinct from a **dropping probability**.

Therefore, all of Applicants’ independent claims are allowable over Sisko and Redden. Also, all of the dependent claims are allowable over Sisko and Redden as well as Sisko and Redden combined with Weishaupt because they depend on allowable base claims.

New Claim

Applicants add new claim 21. The claim is fully supported by Applicants’ specification as originally filed.

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 16, 2007

By: /Rupit Patel/
Rupit Patel, Reg. No. 53,441
(858) 651-7435

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502